

## **REMARKS**

Claims 2 and 5 are now pending in the application. Claims 1 and 3-4 have been cancelled. The amendments to the claims contained herein are of equivalent scope as originally filed and, thus, this amendment is not a narrowing amendment. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

## **REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102**

Claims 1 and 3-4 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Edgington et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,530,804). Claims 1 and 3-4 have been cancelled, thereby rendering the rejections moot.

## **ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER**

The Examiner states that claims 2 and 5 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. Accordingly, Applicant has amended claims 2 and 5 to include the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Therefore, claims 2 and 5 should now be in condition for allowance.


## **CONCLUSION**

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly accommodated or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and

as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: May 5, 2005

By:   
G. Gregory Schivley  
Reg. No. 27,882  
Bryant E. Wade  
Reg. No. 40,344

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.  
P.O. Box 828  
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303  
(248) 641-1600

GGG/BEW/MPD